MINUTES

City of Carrollton Mayor and Council Meeting March 2, 2015 4:30 p.m.

Public Safety Complex, Court/Council Chambers, 115 West Center Street, Carrollton, Georgia

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Mayor and Council met in a regular session on Monday, March 2, 2015, in the Public Safety Annex Building, 115 West Center Street, Carrollton, Georgia. Mayor Pro Tem Mandy Maierhofer called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. Members present: Mayor Pro Tem Maierhofer, Councilmember Gerald Byrd, Councilmember Mike Patterson, and Councilmember Jim Watters. Members absent: Mayor Garner.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Pro Tem Maierhofer.

III. INVOCATION

Councilmember Byrd offered the invocation.

IV. MINUTES (February 2, 2015)

Motion by Councilmember Byrd, seconded by Councilmember Patterson, to approve the Minutes of the February 2, 2015 meeting. (Motion passed 4 – 0, Mayor Garner absent).

V. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were none.

VI. ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

1. Resolution – Be Bright at Night

A Resolution was read by Councilmember Byrd in recognition of Mrs. Mildred (Bunny) Godard's efforts with the "Be Bright at Night" Campaign, urging all citizens to be mindful, to be safe, to be vigilant, to be smart, and to "Be Bright at Night".

2. Carroll Mills Redevelopment

Mr. Sasha Tonic of Mercer University made a presentation regarding the rehabilitation and development of 202 Bradley Street. The former Carroll Mills property was recently purchased by Mr. Richard Diment.

A summary of the presentation included the following information:

The report estimates the economic impact of the proposed real-estate development at 202 Bradley Street in Carrollton, GA on the tri-county region surrounding Carrollton. Counties included in this study are Carroll, Coweta, and Douglas counties, all located in the state of Georgia. Due to the nature of the project, there are two sets of impacts calculated in this study. First is the short-term impact resulting from the construction phase of the project, and second is the long-term, or on-going impact of the project resulting from rental operations and businesses already proposed to occupy the space at 202 Bradley Street.

The total projected construction expense related to rehabilitation of the facility is \$2,593,313 to be spent in 2015. Using the Bureau of Economic Analysis's RIMS II multipliers, it was estimated that the total economic impact of the construction phase will be \$4,233,065 in 2015. Earnings in the tri-county region are expected to rise by \$1,118,237, and a total of 31 new jobs are expected to be created as a result of the investment in the rehabilitation and development of the 202 Bradley Street facility. These effects are considered short-term effects as they will be realized during the construction effort, which will take place during 2015.

Projected rental income following the completion of the project is \$371,424. However, adjusting for the portion of rental revenue that will come from outside of the tri-county area, as well as revenue that is not already spent in the area, and allowing for 7% vacancy rate, the total revenue for purposes of this study is \$277,607. Given this information, rental income is expected to generate \$429,486 total economic impact per year, with expected increase in annual earnings of \$110,543, and an additional 3 jobs. These impacts are annual, long-term impacts as they result from on-going operation of the facility.

Finally, one of the proposed tenants in the rehabilitated building is a restaurant that plans on having \$750,000 in revenues. However, since rental fees are accounted separately, the proposed rent is subtracted from the revenue. Finally, after adjusting for the portion of that revenue that will come from outside of the area of the study and/or new spending in the area, the total restaurant revenue for purposes of this study is \$140,928. Based on this projection, the proposed restaurant will generate \$219,876 in total economic impact and \$53,102 in earnings impact. The restaurant plans to employ 40 employees. Based on RIMS II model, this initial increase in jobs translates into an additional 9 indirect and induced jobs created in the tri-county area, for a total increase of 49 jobs. This is in addition to the jobs created as a result of rental activities.

<u>Clerk's Note</u>: A copy of the Economic Impact Study in its entirety is on file in the City Manager's office and is available upon request.

After the presentation, a resident in attendance inquired as to parking availability. Councilmember Patterson advised that the parking deck could be used for parking as well as the City Hall parking lot.

3. Forest Drive Traffic Analysis

At a previous meeting of the Mayor and Council, Mr. Bruce Bobick appeared before the Mayor and Council requesting speed bumps on Forest Drive due to excessive speeding in the area.

A traffic study was completed by City Engineer Tommy Holland in reference to the requested speed bumps. City Manager Coleman provided an update on the traffic calming analysis and advised that the traffic analysis is not complete due to technical difficulty with the current traffic counters. City Manager Coleman stated that, however, based on the partial information obtained from the traffic study, the 85th percentile speeds recorded for the east bound lane exceed the posted speed limit. The average speed for all vehicles was 40 MPH with 78% vehicles exceeding the posted speed of 30 MPH.

City Manager Coleman stated that he recommends doing nothing except providing more police presence. Councilmember Watters inquired about placing the speed buggy with the flashing speed limit sign in the area. City Manager Coleman advised that the speed buggy was placed in the neighborhood recently, but the Police Department could do so again.

An area resident stated that a neighborhood survey was sent out and the majority of the residents were against the installation of speed bumps.

Mr. George Hamil of 122 Brandywine Trail stated that there is speeding all over the city and the residents in his neighborhood do not want any artificial speed control devices.

Another area resident suggested that the speed limit be lowered to 20 MPH.

Councilmember Patterson suggested that the Police Department begin writing more tickets.

Mr. Bruce Bobick stated that he has a studio on Forest Drive and advised that he sees speeding every day and it's a danger to the neighborhood children. He inquired to the opposed residents in attendance as to whether they wanted convenience or safety.

City Manager Coleman stated that speed bumps hinder emergency response vehicles and can also cause damage to other vehicles.

Mr. Richard Guynn of 104 Ole Hickory Trail stated that he had lived at his residence since 1971 and he is not in favor of speed reducing devices.

Mr. Tommy Thomason of 107 Stonewall Drive stated that if speed bumps were installed, 80 – 90 homes would be impacted and that his suggestion would be for the Police Department to issue more speeding tickets.

Councilmember Byrd suggested implementing an educational campaign which would encourage speed reduction.

City Manager Coleman advised that the City can move forward with more police presence as well as an educational campaign.

Mayor Pro Tem Maierhofer advised that speeding is a problem in the entire city. She also stated that she thinks personal responsibility would work best and we should hold speeders accountable.

4. Sidewalk Installation/Repairs

City Manager Casey Coleman presented to the Mayor and Council for their consideration a request to appropriate an additional \$400,000 from SPLOST proceeds so that repair and installation of sidewalks could continue. Councilmember Patterson recommended using some of the additional funding for sidewalks in Councilmember Byrd's ward. <u>Motion by Councilmember Byrd, seconded by Councilmember Patterson to appropriate an additional \$400,000 from SPLOST proceeds in order to continue repair and installation of sidewalks. (Motion passed 4 – 0, Mayor Garner absent).</u>

5. Bids - Police Evidence Building

City Manager Casey Coleman advised the City has received bids for the proposed Carrollton Police Department Evidence Building. City Manager Coleman advised that there were nine (9) respondents as follows: The low bidder was Wayne Construction Company, Inc., but they were disqualified because they did not have the required contractor's license. The second lowest bidders, Latimer & Hughes Construction Co. and Headley Construction, Inc. were tied at \$1,394,000.

City Manager Coleman stated that after the bid opening, the project was modified, causing a redesign and relocation of the building. It was believed that this change would not cause a major price increase and would improve the function of the building.

City Manager Coleman advised that as both the two low bidders were tied, we had the option of choosing the contractor we preferred and Latimer & Hughes Construction Co. was selected. City Manager Coleman explained that after several weeks of dealing with Latimer & Hughes Construction Co., he does not recommend that we award the contract to build this project for the City of Carrollton to them, as their price

has increased from \$1,394,000 to \$1,483,000 (an increase of \$89,900). City Manager Coleman explained that he understands that with the modifications that were made to the project that the price could increase slightly, but he feels that \$89,900 is excessive.

City Manager Coleman stated that because the project has changed and has presented some complications, it is his recommendation that all bids be rejected that the process be started anew. City Manager Coleman advised that he believes that we may fair better on this project by utilizing a different process and soliciting "Request for Proposals" (RFP's) because this method allows us to be more involved in the entire process, rather just getting a straight bid price. <u>Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Maierhofer, seconded by Councilmember Watters to reject all previous bids for the project and solicit "Request for Proposals (RFP's) for the Carrollton Police Department Evidence Building. (Motion passed 4 – 0, Mayor Garner absent).</u>

6. Property Purchases

City Manager Casey Coleman advised that several years ago the City purchased approximately 70 acres just off Kingsbridge Road for the construction of a future Water Treatment Settling Pond. City Manager Coleman stated that at that time, we were unable to purchase the frontage properties associated with the original tracts of land.

City Manager Coleman advised that the frontage consists of two parcels which are both zoned industrial as follows: 5.76 acres belonging to the Raymond Hughes Estate and 7.308 acres belonging to Robert Jean. We had the Jean property appraised with the results being over \$30,000 per acre. City Coleman stated that both Mr. Jean and the Hughes family have agreed to a price of \$30,000 per acre. City Manager Coleman informed the Mayor and Council that the Hughes property has an old home on the property that the family is keeping and if the property is purchased by the City the Hughes family will have one year to empty and demolish the structure.

City Manager Coleman emphasized that the tracts are properties that we believe the City will need in the future. In addition, City Manager Coleman advised that we also want to protect our future reservoir from an industry that might impact the quality of our drinking water.

City Manager Coleman stated that it is staff's recommendation that the Mayor and Council authorize the purchase of the Robert Jean tract in the amount of \$219,240.00 and the Hughes tract in the amount of \$172,800.00. Motion by Councilmember Patterson, seconded by Councilmember Byrd to authorize the City Staff to move forward with the purchase of the Robert Jean tract of property in the amount of \$219,240 and move forward with the purchase of the Hughes property in the amount of \$172,800.00. (Motion passed 4 – 0, Mayor Garner absent.

VII. MAYOR AND COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmember Byrd thanked employees and others who put their lives on the line to make things run smoothly in the city.

VIII. CITY MANAGER ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

IX. ADJOURN

There being no additional business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.